

This report is presented as received by IDRC from project recipient(s). It has not been subjected to peer review or other review processes.

This work is used with the permission of Rimisp-Latin American Center for Rural Development.

© 2007, Rimisp-Latin American Center for Rural Development.



**Rimisp – Latin American Center for Rural Development  
in the WDR2008 ‘Agriculture for Development’**

**Assessment of its influence**

**Final Report to IDRC of Project N° 103897-001  
November 2007**

## CONTENTS

<i>Introduction</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>The results of Rimisp's contribution</i>	<i>2</i>
Some quantitative results	2
Some qualitative results	4
<i>Analysis of the policy work regarding the WDR2008</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Some lessons for Rimisp</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Annexes</i>	<i>8</i>
Annex 1. Documents Commissioned by Rimisp for the WDR 2008	9
Annex 2. Toronto Workshop Report	11
Annex 3. Report of the Global Electronic Consultation on the WDR2008	12
Annex 4. Survey of Rimisp's contribution to the WDR2008, response by Alain de Janvry	13
Annex 5. Survey of Rimisp's contribution to the WDR2008, response by Derek Byerlee	17
Annex 6. messages of the WDR2008 as influenced by Civil Society Workshop	19

# **Rimisp – Latin American Center for Rural Development in the WDR2008 ‘Agriculture for Development’**

## **Assessment of its influence**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Upon receipt of an invitation to involve Rimisp in the production of the WDR2008<sup>1</sup>, and to Julio Berdegue, then President of Rimisp, to be part of the WDR core team, Rimisp discussed broadly the general objectives of its involvement, established a team that would lead the process and contacted fellow support organizations, such as IDRC and ICCO. It also defined the breath of its involvement, the main areas of interest where it would try to influence the final report and defined how it would involve the different partners with whom it has a continuous interaction. Nonetheless this initial planning was revised through the whole process.

While Rimisp had worked previously with international multilateral organizations such as IDB, FAO, IFAD and IICA and had been generally successful in influencing its policies and strategies, this had been often done on the basis of consultancies. Additionally it had been done at a regional LAC level and mostly concentrated on rural development. The case of the World Bank’s WDR2008 was that of a global study and policy document. This implied reaching out to scholars, activists and farmer organizations globally and specially in the global South.

Reacting to a draft Overview and story line which had been assembled by Derek Byerlee and Alain de Janvry (lead co-authors of the WDR2008) and after a discussion within Rimisp, a proposal was presented to IDRC. The document defined the general objective of the organization’s policy work in accepting the invitation to participate in the WDR2008 process: contribute to the design of a post-Washington Consensus global strategic agenda on agriculture and development. The *specific objectives* were set to:

1. Integrate and popularize two ongoing lines of research currently being supported by Rimisp (the restructuring of domestic agrifood markets for small farmers and rural industries; rural territorial development) into conceptual approaches to rural development.
2. Enhance the inclusion and serious analysis of alternative perspectives on agriculture and development in rural development thinking.
3. Create spaces for the inclusion and active participation of experts from the South as contributing authors.

In setting such objectives Rimisp wanted to assure its team and constituency that it would go beyond conventional analysis and recommendations, that it would bring in Southern thought and that it would seek to contribute mainly in areas where the interest and capacities of the organization were. Finally Rimisp proposed working with a mix of academic contributions and a process of global consultation, broadly representing the perspectives of civil society, social organizations and social movements, small and medium private sector associations, and researchers and intellectuals, primarily from the South.

---

<sup>1</sup> World Bank. 2007. World Development Report 2008 ‘Agriculture for Development’. World Bank, Washington DC, 365 p.

Regarding papers to be developed for the WDR2008, Rimisp proposed producing 9 papers (table 1).

**Table 1. Original list of expected papers to be produced for the WDR2008**

Chapter	Papers	Lead author
5	The retail-led transformation of agrifood systems	Thomas Reardon
5	High-value and niche market products	Stefano Ponte (tbc)
5	Agrifood processing	Gabriela Dutrénit (tbc)
10	Territorial rural development	Alexander Schejtman
10	Agricultural exit problem	Peter Hazell
10	Changing role of small farms	Steve Wiggins (tbc)
10	Feminization of agricultura	Carmen Deere (tbc) or Ruth K. Oniang'o (tbc)
10	Agroecological and low-input agriculture	Jules Pretty (tbc)
10	The new roles of the public sector	Manuel Chiriboga

Source: Grant proposal submitted to IDRC

Rimisp assembled a team to prepare its contribution to the WDR. It was led by Julio A. Berdegue, Alexander Schejtman and Manuel Chiriboga. Other Rimisp professional and support staff would also collaborate as needed. In addition to the above, the IDRC grant would also support the work of Dr. Elisabeth Sadoulet, Professor, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, University of California at Berkeley. Dr. Sadoulet's contribution was requested as a part time core WDR team member.

## THE RESULTS OF RIMISP'S CONTRIBUTION

Results can be analyzed in two broad ways: specific quantitative targets regarding papers, consultations and team; and qualitatively, regarding the achievement of policy objectives. Obviously the first set of indicators can be easily measured and compared with initial targets. The analysis of policy objectives is more complex, especially regarding attribution. We use a number of approaches to discuss results, including text analysis and evaluation by WDR team members.

### *Some quantitative results*

Regarding quantitative targets, the following was achieved:

- A total of 42 background papers were specifically commissioned for the WDR2008. Of these, 26 papers (61%) were commissioned by Rimisp, almost three times the number originally proposed. Of these, 15 were produced by Southern researchers, two had mixed teams and nine came from researchers from the North. In total 48 researchers participated in producing the papers. Nine papers were prepared by Rimisp staff, eight by partners with whom Rimisp has collaborated in the past, and eight with new partners with whom we not worked together in the past. As shown in table 2, the papers were cited in eight chapters of the WDR2008, in one special focus section and in the Overview. Papers commissioned by Rimisp influenced a much broader section of the WDR, well beyond chapters 5 and 10, originally targeted.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> In Annex 1 we list the papers commissioned by Rimisp.

- b. Regarding consultations, Rimisp organized two events: one face to face workshop with the participation of 34 delegates from previously identified stakeholders and one electronic consultation with 1350 subscribed participants and one hundred active contributors. We had thus one more consultation than the one identified in the proposal.

**Table 2. References to Rimisp papers in WDR - 2008**

<b>Chapter</b>	<b>Number of references to papers produced by Rimisp</b>
Overview	1
Chapter 2 – Agriculture’s performance	1
Chapter 3 – Households and pathways	2
Chapter 5 - Markets	10
Chapter 7 – Innovation and R&D	1
Chapter 8 - Environment	1
Chapter 9 – Rural labor markets	1
Chapter 10 – Regional agendas	5
Chapter 11 - Governance	1
Focus G	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>

Source. WDR2008

- c. The consultation meeting on the draft white Overview took place in Toronto, Canada, on 25 and 26 January 2007, with participants from social movements, social organizations and NGOs from Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America, North America and from international organizations, including key members of the WDR2008 core team. In addition to participant’s oral and written contributions to the workshop itself, in the aftermath of the meeting, the WDR2008 core team were presented with 43 short case studies (or “boxes”) expanding on most of the report’s areas of interest. This was a non planned contribution. To organize this event Rimisp counted not only with IDRC financial contribution, but also from ICCO and from northern NGOs and organizations financing their travel. Preparation of said case studies was also financed by participants and contributors.<sup>3</sup> A core member of the WDR team described the role of the Toronto consultations as: “I would rate this consultation as highly useful. It had substantial influence on the WDR. We added a chapter on governance as a result. We also went back and rewrote several sections relating to market liberalization, food security, land markets.”
- d. The electronic consultation on the draft yellow cover WDR2008 Report took place between April 9 and April 21, 2007. It started and ended with letters by the WDR directors and Rimisp-Latin American Center for Rural Development, host organization and moderator of the electronic discussion. Throughout the consultation the number of participants stayed stable at around 1370 subscribed persons.<sup>4</sup> About 100 persons were actively participating, with an average of around 16 messages per day. In total about 200 messages were exchanged. Participants came from almost every region of the World: Australia, all regions of Africa; South, Southeast and East Asia; Western, Central and Eastern Europe; Latin America and North America. It involved participants from different organizational origins: universities, NGOs, multilateral and bilateral development organizations, national and

<sup>3</sup> In annex 2 we include the report of the Toronto consultation.

<sup>4</sup> The consultation started on April 9 with 1354 participants, on Saturday 14, 1376 participants continued to be active and by Sunday 22, 1360 were subscribed.

subnational governments, farmer organizations, private sector and consultants. This consultation was financed by the World Bank and counted with an active role of research and technical support from Rimisp.<sup>5</sup> This consultation implied developing a chapter and expanding among others natural resource analysis.

- e. Rimisp organized a team comprised of Julio Berdegúe, Alexander Schejtman, Manuel Chiriboga and Gilles Cliche, principal researchers and of Félix Modrego and Romain Charnay assistant researchers at the time. It also supported Dr. Sadoulet's participation.

## ***Some qualitative results***

As mentioned above, Rimisp planned to influence two specific areas: restructuring of domestic agrifood markets for small farmers and rural territorial development. These correspond roughly to chapters 5 and 10. Did we achieve this?

If we look at the number of references to papers produced in relation to these two subjects, clearly it is where we seem to have been able to influence more. As can be seen in table 2, out of a total of 24 references to the contributions of Rimisp, five are related to chapter 10 (regional strategies) and 10 to chapter 5 (markets).

But beyond tracking bibliographic references, some papers influenced ample sections of specific chapters: Paper 4 and paper 16 (Annex 1) for example influenced the regional strategy proposal for Latin America, and papers 11, 13, 21 and 25 did the same regarding chapter 5 on bringing small producers to markets. One author noted that "Chapter 5 has a section on "Traditional bulk export commodities", much of which draws on my background paper." The Rimisp-commissioned papers influenced very much also a whole other chapter, not initially envisioned: chapter 9 on non agricultural activities in the rural areas (Moving beyond the farm).

The impact of Rimisp's contribution was also underlined by the two team leaders responsible for the report: Alain de Janvry and Derek Byerlee as can be seen in annexes 4 and 5. De Janvry states that: "Background papers were used throughout the Report. Rimisp staff, in particular Julio Berdegúe, Manuel Chiriboga, and Alejandro Schejtman, provided guidance over the whole Report. Specific Rimisp contributions are most particularly in six chapters: Chapter 3 where the conditions of rural households are analyzed, in particular the status of smallholders, making use of original statistical work done by Felix Modrego and others; Chapter 5 deriving from the research done by Rimisp and Thomas Reardon on supermarkets, agroindustry, and smallholders; Chapter 6 on producer organizations, that drew importantly from work done by Julio Berdegúe on organizations and collective action in support of smallholder competitiveness; Chapter 9 where the rural nonfarm economy and territorial approaches to rural development are considered, deriving information from some of the seminal contributions made by Rimisp to these areas of knowledge, in particular the background paper on territorial development written by Julio Berdegúe and Alejandro Schejtman; Chapter 10 on policy agendas that was initially drafted by Rimisp, and final writing was most influential for the agenda concerning urbanized countries of which Latin America is the dominant group; Chapter 11 with a background paper prepared on ministries of agriculture by Roberto Martínez-Nogueira."

---

<sup>5</sup> In Annex 3 we include a report of the electronic consultation

It can therefore be said that Rimisp's role went well beyond chapters 5 and 10 originally targeted. In influencing some of the chapters and specially chapter 10, we met the second specific objective: serious analysis of alternative perspectives on agriculture and rural development thinking. Chapter 10 which was, at least in the section relating to urbanized economies, where Latin America as included, was developed around a paper submitted by the organization (paper 4). In addition, as informed by Dr. de Janvry, the Toronto consultation directly led to the addition of a brand new chapter on governance and policy processes (chapter 11), that highlights the importance of politics and political economies in bringing about the pro-poor changes and policies discussed in the WDR2008.

Another domain where Rimisp had an overall influence is that of the main messages of the report. While this was not an intended result, a careful analysis of them demonstrates that the events that we organized had an effect on them, specifically the Toronto Workshop and the electronic consultation. In annex 6 we have included the main WDR2008 messages and put in bold the parts where we feel we contributed to changes.<sup>6</sup>

The electronic conference "helped focus the emphasis of the WDR squarely on the importance of a smallholder approach to agriculture for development in order to achieve both growth and poverty reduction, the importance of the supermarket revolution and mechanisms through which producer organizations can respond, the role of organizations in participating to territorial development, and specification of an agenda for Latin America and the Caribbean. The consultation raised many of the "hot topics" of the moment that had to be considered by the WDR: the importance of progressing with the Doha round of trade negotiations, the feasibility of using trade protection for special products, the role and management of subsidies to support smallholder farming, the expected benefits and risks from GMOs, the urgency of addressing adaptation to climate change, and the expected impacts of demand for bio-fuels on agricultural growth, food prices, and the environment," as mentioned by Alain de Janvry.

## **ANALYSIS OF THE POLICY WORK REGARDING THE WDR2008**

Rimisp's overall contribution has been synthesized by Alain de Janvry in the following way: *"This WDR would not have been the same without Rimisp's multiple contributions. Rimisp not only helped generate information that was essential for many chapters, it also contributed expertise, advice, and direct writing to the Report that greatly influenced content and quality"*. How was this achieved? <sup>7</sup>At least the following can help explain it:

- a. There was an observable coincidence between the WDR2008 lead team and Rimisp researchers on areas where the organization had been doing research, and Rimisp and its members were recognized as leaders in areas such as the new roles of supermarkets in agriculture and on the whole field of Territorial Rural Development. There was also recognition of Rimisp active participation and leadership in academic and civil society

---

<sup>6</sup> Several international NGOs such as the influential OXFAM International said in a report that the main messages of the WDR 2008, were, in general lines, welcome and mentioned some of them specifically. On the other hand, ActionAid has issued an extremely critical review of the WDR2008. The International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP) welcomed the report, and stated "The World Development Report is a publication that will be used by many international organizations and by national governments to support their decision-making and we are proud as farmers to have included our voice into this report" ([www.ifap.org](http://www.ifap.org)).

<sup>7</sup> Some concepts used in this section draw freely from Evert A. Lindquist, *Discerning Policy Influence: Framework for a Strategic Evaluation of IDRC-Supported Research*, IDRC, September 1, 2001.

networks relating to the main areas of interest for the report. This mix of a serious academic organization and a networking system of work attracted the interest of the core team. This knowledge on Rimisp was based on the personal experience of one of the lead team members.

- b. The fact that one of Rimisp main researchers was invited to become part of the expanded writing team established a channel through which the organization was able to have a better and detailed knowledge of the report from a very initial moment. This helped identify opportunities of policy dialogue and influence that an outsider organization could not have. At the same time its outside links helped Rimisp keep an independent perspective from the core team and nourish it with more critical perspectives. It also implied that WDR core team participated actively in the consultations organized by Rimisp.
- c. The networking character of Rimisp was very effective in bringing to the discussion a number of very influential papers far beyond the areas of work of Rimisp. It also assured an increased role of southern academics, especially from LAC, but not only. Rimisp was able to contact scholars from Asia and Africa also for its different activities. This makes Rimisp a special type of organization, which is not a traditional think tank, NGO or research center.
- d. Rimisp's effectiveness was also assured by what has been called Policy entrepreneurs in the sense that key members of its team were able to deliver in short periods of time high quality work, tapping from its own resources and of people outside its organizations. They were able to organize complex consultations and deliver synthesis geared towards producing desirable changes in the report. A specific element of this policy entrepreneurship was the ability to access resources to secure the whole effort. IDRC was the main contributor, but Rimisp could also bring in some other partners such as ICCO, the World Bank itself, but also in kind contributions from a large range of NGOs, such as OXFAM, African Institute for Community Driven Development, ANGOC, IFAP and Farm Africa.
- e. Rimisp was able on short notice to establish what can be called a policy dialogue community made up of researchers, activists, public servants, NGO and social movement representatives and a small number of private sector representatives, men and women, basically southern centered but with the participation of northern individuals and organizations. This community did not have a sole perspective on agriculture and rural development, was plural in every sense of the word, which brought in a number of ideas, experiences and comments. In some cases, such as in the role of supermarkets, strong differences were put forward. But Rimisp was able to put together papers that ordered and synthesized the discussions, which before being presented formally to the WDR team were sent back for final comments from participants. What was also interesting of this policy dialogue community was the good mix of grassroots people and academics being able to work together and arrive to common ground.
- f. A special characteristic of Rimisp was its technical communication capacity. In a short notice it was able to put together a technical team that could prepare a specialized Web page, a multilingual e-conference, distribute papers and translate them in at least 3 languages. Timing of this effort made the whole process of policy dialogue and soft advocacy flow easily.



## **SOME LESSONS FOR RIMISP**

Some of the points made above constitute valuable lessons for future Rimisp policy related work. but there are also some shortcomings to which Rimisp needs to pay attention:

- a. It is unfortunate that work on policy on a number of international organizations depends on good contacts and personal relations. Doing good work on a specific area does not assure being kept in the radar of future policy work. Rimisp with the help of partners such as IDRC should work on how organizations like the World Bank can modify their working relations, especially with Southern research centers and networks, and try to limit the influence of personal connections.
- b. Rimisp has to adjust its working process as to have a more continuous work on policy issues. As one participant suggested, this could be done through the establishment of focused discussion and working groups that continually exchange ideas, papers and results to generate evidence-based policy recommendations. Two additional contributions from Rimisp are: (a) the identification of key issues and questions for debate and; (b) the facilitation of links and discussion between non-connected knowledge networks and groups. By helping to set the agenda and then facilitating as wide and diverse an involvement as possible, Rimisp adds value to normally dispersed academic research initiatives. This requires establishing within Rimisp a process regarding policy.
- c. While there are areas where Rimisp effort excels such as market related issues and TRD there seems to be an issue related to institutions and governance regarding agriculture and rural development where in the future more work should be done.
- d. There are some broken links in the policy discussions where we have to work. In some cases, paper authors did not participate or did not know of other consultations; in other cases people that participated in one activity did not know what happened afterwards and an information failure was produced. These are technical issues that have to be solved, maybe having a kind of policy discussion manager.
- e. Rimisp could have a more pro-active role in linking academic discussions and policy debates and alternatives. This is something where the bridging capacity is crucial, as to assure a more fluid relation between different networks within policy dialogue communities.

## **ANNEXES**

## ***Annex 1. Documents Commissioned by Rimisp for the WDR 2008***

The papers commissioned by Rimisp for the WDR2008 are available from [www.worldbank.org/wdr2008](http://www.worldbank.org/wdr2008) and from [www.rimisp.org/wdr2008](http://www.rimisp.org/wdr2008). They are also included in this report in a separate volume.

1. Aldana, Ursula. 2006. "The Importance of Agriculture in Isolated Areas in the Peruvian Andes." Background Note for the WDR 2008. 1 reference (footnote 16 focus G)
2. Barrera, Arturo. 2007. "The Management Centers in Chile." Centro Latinoamericano para el Desarrollo Rural (RIMISP). Santiago de Chile. Processed. 1 reference (footnote 16 focus G)
3. Berdegú, Julio. 2007. "Cooperating to Compete – Easier Said than Done". Rimisp-Centro Latinoamericano para el Desarrollo Rural. ." Background Note for the WDR 2008. 0 references.
4. Berdegú, Julio, Alexander Schejtman, Manuel Chiriboga, Félix Modrego, Romain Charnay, and Jorge Ortega. 2006. "Towards National and Global Agendas: Latin America and the Caribbean." Background paper for the WDR 2008. 1 reference (footnote 22, chap. 10).
5. Bezemer, Dirk, and Peter Hazell. 2006. "The Agricultural Exit Problem; An Empirical Assessment." Background paper for the WDR 2008. 0 references.
6. Chiriboga, Manuel, Romain Charnay, and Carol Chehab. 2006. "Women in Agriculture: Some Results of Household Surveys Data Analysis." Background paper for the WDR 2008. 0 references.
7. Chiriboga, Manuel. 2007. "Ecuadorian Trade Negotiations and Small Farmers, Case study prepared for WDR 2008." 0 references.
8. Damiani, Octavio. 2007. "Rural Development from a Territorial Perspective: Case Studies in Asia and Latin America." Background paper for the WDR 2008. 1 reference (footnote 29, chap. 9).
9. da Veiga, José Eli. 2007. "Brazil in the 1990's". Rimisp-Centro Latinoamericano para el Desarrollo Rural. Background Note for the WDR 2008. 0 references.
10. Escobar, German, Carlos Mladinic, Ramiro Sanhueza and Octavio Diaz. 2006. "Rural Territorial Development: The Milk Territory in Southern Chile." Background paper for the WDR 2008. 0 references.
11. Farnworth, Cathy, and Michael Goodman. 2007. "Growing Ethical Networks: The Fair Trade Market for Raw and Processed Agricultural Products (in Five Parts), with Associated Case Studies on Africa and Latin America." Background paper for the WDR 2008. 3 references (footnotes 72 y 74 chap 5; footnote 20, chap 10).
12. Hazell, Peter, Colin Poulton, Steve Wiggins, and Andrew Dorward. 2006. "The Future of Small Farms: Synthesis Paper." Background paper for the WDR 2008. 0 references.

13. Henson, Spencer. 2006. "New Markets and Their Supporting Institutions: Opportunities and Constraints for Demand Growth." Background paper for the WDR 2008. 5 references (footnotes 57, 74, 78 y 82 chaps 5; footnote 20 chap 10).
14. Lastarria-Cornhiel, Susana. 2006. "Feminization of Agriculture: Trends and Driving Forces." Background paper for the WDR 2008. 1 reference (footnote 20, chap 3).
15. Lundy, Mark. 2007. "New forms of collective action by small scale growers". Rimisp-Centro Latinoamericano para el Desarrollo Rural. Background Note for the WDR 2008. 0 references.
16. Martínez Nogueira, Roberto. 2007. "New Roles of the Public Sector for an Agriculture for Development Agenda." Background paper for the WDR 2008. 2 references (footnotes 24 y 29, chap 10).
17. Modrego, Félix, Romain Charnay, Esteban Jara, Hugo Contreras, and Cristian Rodriguez. 2006. "Small Farmers in Developing Countries: Some Results of Household Surveys Data Analysis." Background paper for the WDR 2008. 0 references.
18. Pomareda, Carlos. 2006. "Contract Agriculture: Lessons from Experiences in Costa Rica." Background paper for the WDR 2008. 0 references.
19. Pretty, Jules. 2006. "Agroecological Approaches to Agricultural Development." Background paper for the WDR 2008. 2 references (footnote 38 chap 7 and footnote 45 chap 8).
20. Quan, Julian, Junior Davis, and Felicity Proctor. 2006. "Rural Development from a Territorial Perspective: Lessons and Potential in Sub-Saharan Africa." Background paper for the WDR 2008. 0 references.
21. Reardon, Thomas, and Julio Berdegue. 2006. "The Retail-Led Transformation of Agrifood Systems and its Implications for Development Policies." Background paper for the WDR 2008. 6 references (figure 5.5, footnote 9 overview, footnotes 35, 38, 40, 42 chap 5).
22. Reardon, Thomas and Julio Berdegue. 2007. Box focusing on whether the rise of supermarkets exclude small farmers. Background Note for the WDR 2008. 0 references.
23. Sautier, Denis, Hester Vermeulen, Michel Fok, and Estelle Biénabe. 2006. "Case Studies of Agri-Processing and Contract Agriculture in Africa." Background paper for the WDR 2008. 0 references.
24. Schejtman, Alexander, Julio Berdegue, and Félix Modrego. 2006. "Income Diversification through Agricultural Development." Background paper for the WDR 2008. 0 references
25. Wilkinson, John, and Rudi Rocha. 2006. "Agri-Processing and Developing Countries." Background paper for the WDR 2008. 1 reference (footnote 18 chap 10).
26. Zhang, Linxiu, Scott Rozelle, Chengfang Liu, Susan Olivia, Alan de Brauw, and Qiang Li. 2007. "Feminization of Agriculture in China: Debunking the Myth and Measuring the Consequence of Women Participation in Agriculture." Background paper for the WDR 2008. 1 reference (footnote 18, chap 3).

## ***Annex 2. Toronto Workshop Report***

Available in a separate volume.

### ***Annex 3. Report of the Global Electronic Consultation on the WDR2008***

Available in a separate volume.

## ***Annex 4. Survey of Rimisp's contribution to the WDR2008, response by Alain de Janvry***

- 1. Could you please identify the main substantive areas where you think Rimisp, Latin American Center for Rural Development contributed to the WDR? Can you identify them specifically?**

Rimisp contributed to the WDR in several important ways. The first was by identifying themes and authors to prepare 25 background papers for the various chapters of the Report. Most of these papers were of high quality and have been used and cited in the Report. They are attached to the Report in electronic form and publicly available. The second was by running a very well attended and effectively managed electronic consultation. Some 120 people made contributions and more than 600 were listening to the debates. Rimisp was effective in making use of its extensive links to NGOs and grassroots organizations to reach a group of stakeholders from whom it was important to have suggestions and feedbacks. Introductory statements were prepared by Rimisp for the successive rounds of consultations and information received summarized. The suggestions made through the consultation were quite influential on the content of the WDR. Rimisp, together with IDRC and ICCO, organized a very effective consultation with civil society organizations from across the world held in Toronto (January 25-26, 2007). This meeting helped collect a large number of case studies, several of which were used in the Report. It also helped get acquainted with perspectives of important civil society stakeholders at an early stage in the writing which allowed incorporating suggestions received. The third was through direct participation by several Rimisp staff members to meetings held throughout the process of developing the Report. Rimisp was used as a source of expertise throughout the development of the Report, with frequent consultations that led to ideas incorporated in the Report. The Report was also closely reviewed in its entirety by Rimisp staff. Finally, and most importantly, Rimisp drafted large segments of several chapters, in particular Chapter 5 on markets and smallholders, Chapter 9 on territorial development, and Chapter 10 on agendas for specific regions of the world, Latin America in particular. These are two important chapters where Rimisp expertise and own research provided invaluable materials.

- 2. Of these, where in the WDR report do you see them reflected? (Could you mention chapters and/or sub – chapters?)**

Background papers were used throughout the Report. Rimisp staff, in particular Julio Berdegue, Manuel Chiriboga, and Alejandro Schejtman, provided guidance over the whole Report. Specific Rimisp contributions are most particularly in six chapters: Chapter 3 where the conditions of rural households are analyzed, in particular the status of smallholders, making use of original statistical work done by Felix Modrego and others; Chapter 5 deriving from the research done by Rimisp and Thomas Reardon on supermarkets, agro industry, and smallholders; Chapter 6 on producer organizations, that drew importantly from work done by Julio Berdegue on organizations and collective action in support of smallholder competitiveness; Chapter 9 where the rural nonfarm economy and territorial approaches to rural development are considered, deriving information from some of the seminal contributions made by Rimisp to these areas of knowledge, in particular the background paper on territorial development written by Julio Berdegue and Alejandro Schejtman; Chapter 10 on policy agendas that was initially drafted by Rimisp, and final writing was most influential for the agenda concerning urbanized countries of which Latin America is the dominant

group; Chapter 11 with a background paper prepared on ministries of agriculture by Roberto Nogueira.

**3. Could you please identify (Rimisp-commissioned) case studies that have influenced the way in which WDR reflects on specific issues?**

Case studies that have influenced the WDR are broadly dispersed in the Report. Some of the most important background papers commissioned by Rimisp that provided case study materials were the following:

Octavio Damiani's case studies of territorial development in Asian and Latin American countries, especially his analysis of the San Francisco Valley development in Brazil.

Jules Pretty's pragmatic discussion of alternative approaches to sustainable farming systems, with specific examples of low input agriculture.

Julio Berdegue's work on producer organizations in Chile and conditions for success in servicing their members.

Arturo Barrera's case study of management centers in Chile.

Thomas Reardon and Julio Berdegue's research on supermarkets with country case studies covering Central America and Mexico.

Susanna Lastarria-Cornhiel's work on feminization of agriculture in Latin America.

Linxiu Zhang and others' work on lack of a feminization trend in Chinese agriculture.

Cathy Farnworth and Michael Goodman's analysis of new markets especially with ethical concerns such as Fair Trade.

Spencer Henson's analysis of emerging new markets for agriculture and expectations for growth.

John Wilkinson and Rudi Rocha's analyses of the agro-processing sector.

Roberto Martinez Nogueira's analysis of transformation of the forms and functions of ministries of agriculture in Latin America.

Julio Berdegue's et al. specification of agriculture-for-development agendas for the Latin American countries, analyzing the conditions for competitiveness of a smallholder sector and territorial approaches to rural poverty reduction.

Ursula Adana's analysis of agriculture in remote areas of the Peruvian Andes.

In all cases, Rimisp exercised quality control in the development of these papers, with final drafts delivered in a form that allowed electronic publication as companion to the Report.

**4. Of these, where in the WDR report do you see them reflected? (Could you mention chapters and/or sub – chapters?)**

**5. How do you judge the quality and influence of papers that Rimisp contracted out with other scholars?**

Most of the 25 background papers were influential on the Report. The 13 papers mentioned above were the most directly used as they contributed case study materials. All papers were carefully read by the WDR team and ideas were broadly influential even when specific case studies were not extracted from some of the papers received.

**6. Which were the most influential and where in the WDR report do you think this is reflected (could you mention chapters, sub – chapters?)**



**7. What is your evaluation of the Civil Society Consultation organized by Rimisp in Toronto, Canada and how did it influence the WDR?**

The Toronto consultation brought together representatives from 27 civil society organizations coming from Africa, Asia, Latin America, Europe, and North America. It was ably organized by Gilles Cliche from Rimisp and animated by Jim Woodhill from Wageningen University. The meeting was conducted in an interactive fashion, stimulating creativity in small working groups and interactions with the whole group of participants. It also led to identification of case studies and subsequent delivery of information on these cases. The meeting was attended in particular by Jack Wilkinson, president of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers that led to subsequent collaboration with IFAP for the launch of the WDR. Continuing collaboration with IFAP is expected in preparing a response to the WDR by producer organizations and discussion at the next IFAP annual meeting in Warsaw.

**8. Where and in what way are the results of this consultation reflected in the WDR?**

**9. What is your evaluation of the WDR electronic consultation?**

- a. Regarding the number and breath of participants?

This consultation was highly professional. Many subjects were addressed. However, most notably, the consultation helped focus the emphasis of the WDR squarely on the importance of a smallholder approach to agriculture for development in order to achieve both growth and poverty reduction, the importance of the supermarket revolution and mechanisms through which producer organizations can respond, the role of organizations in participating to territorial development, and specification of an agenda for Latin America and the Caribbean. The consultation raised many of the “hot topics” of the moment that had to be considered by the WDR: the importance of progressing with the Doha round of trade negotiations, the feasibility of using trade protection for special products, the role and management of subsidies to support smallholder farming, the expected benefits and risks from GMOs, the urgency of addressing adaptation to climate change, and the expected impacts of demand for biofuels on agricultural growth, food prices, and the environment.

- b. Regarding the quality of the contributions?
- c. Regarding the quality of the synthesis?

The themes selected for discussion, initial statements prepared to stimulate discussion, feedbacks from participants, and syntheses were prepared by Manuel Chiriboga and his team in a highly effective fashion. It was indeed a privilege to have such highly qualified experts devoting their time to the consultation. The syntheses were extensively used in preparing the next draft of the WDR.

**10. Where in the WDR report do you think this is reflected (could you mention chapters and sub – chapters?)**

**11. How do you asses Rimisp’s contribution over all?**

This WDR would not have been the same without Rimisp’s multiple contributions. Rimisp not only helped generate information that was essential for many chapters, it also contributed expertise, advice, and direct writing to the Report that greatly influenced content and quality. The main ideas to which Rimisp made contributions were the following: competitiveness of smallholders and future of the family farm; income diversification for rural households and the role of the rural nonfarm

economy; the supermarket revolution and its implications for smallholders; participation to modern food markets including supermarkets, fair trade, and contracts with agroindustry; producer organizations and determinants of their effectiveness in collective action; a territorial approach to local growth, poverty reduction, and environmental management; an agriculture-for-development agenda for Latin America; new forms of governance for agriculture running from ministries of agriculture, to decentralization, and community participation; mainstreaming gender throughout the report; and identifying a range of approaches to sustainable agriculture.

**12. In what areas do you feel Rimisp could enhance its work regarding future broad policy discussions?**

Rimisp can play a major role in better understanding and promoting territorial approaches to rural development, one of the Center's trademark ideas. In that sense, Rimisp can play an important role in linking WDR 2008 on agriculture for development to WDR 2009 on territorial approaches to development. Continuity in policy directions proposed by the successive WDRs is very important for impact and effectiveness. Rimisp can also contribute importantly to a better understanding of how the transformation of food markets impacts on smallholder farming, and help define agriculture-for-development agendas for the different countries and regions of Latin America and the Caribbean. In that sense, Rimisp could play a major role in: (1) participating to the next phase of the WDR 2008 process consisting in the elaboration of agendas to translate WDR generic messages into specific country and region agendas and their implementation; and (2) participating to preparation of the WDR 2009 as an area of recognized Rimisp expertise with the ability to relate policy messages from WDR 2009 to those of WDR 2008.

## ***Annex 5. Survey of Rimisp's contribution to the WDR2008, response by Derek Byerlee***

- 1. Could you please identify the main substantive areas where you think Rimisp, Latin American Center for Rural Development contributed to the WDR? Can you identify them specifically?**

New markets and supermarkets  
Producer organization and civil society  
Territorial development  
Gender  
New roles of the state, civil society etc  
An agriculture for development agenda for Latin America

- 2. Of these, where in the WDR report do you see them reflected? (Could you mention chapters and/or sub – chapters?)**

Chapter 3 and 9, especially gender perspectives and labor markets  
Chapter 9 on territorial development  
Chapter 5 in the sections on high value markets and nontraditional exports  
Chapter 6 in all almost all sections  
Chapter 10 on the agenda for urbanized countries  
Chapter 11 on new roles of the state, decentralization

- 3. Could you please identify (Rimisp-commissioned) case studies that have influenced the way in which WDR reflects on specific issues?**

Case studies on territorial development—Ecuador, Brazil  
Case studies on producer organizations and new markets from Latin America

- 4. Of these, where in the WDR report do you see them reflected? (Could you mention chapters and/or sub – chapters?)**

Mostly chapters 5 and 9, as well as 10

- 5. How do you judge the quality and influence of papers that Rimisp contracted out with other scholars?<sup>8</sup>**

Quality was variable as expected. However, several were of excellent quality, and especially those relating to the themes in 1 above—new markets etc

- 6. Which were the most influential and where in the WDR report do you think this is reflected (could you mention chapters, sub – chapters?)**

Chapter 5 -- Role of supermarkets, Agricultural processing

---

<sup>8</sup> Contributions are listed at: <http://www.rimisp.cl/seccion.php?seccion=576>

**7. What is your evaluation of the Civil Society Consultation organized by Rimisp in Toronto, Canada and how did it influence the WDR?**

I would rate this consultation as highly useful. It had substantial influence on the WDR. We added a chapter on governance as a result. We also went back and rewrote several sections relating to market liberalization, food security, land markets

**8. Where and in what way are the results of this consultation reflected in the WDR?**

See above—new chapter 11, tone of chapters 4 and 6 and focus on food security.

**9. What is your evaluation of the WDR electronic consultation?**

a) Regarding the number and breath of participants?

Quality of participation was generally very good although only a small number were active

b) Regarding the quality of the contributions?

.Quality was generally very good.

c) Regarding the quality of the synthesis?

Very good. RIMISP is a professional at this

**10. Where in the WDR report do you think this is reflected (could you mention chapters and sub – chapters?)**

Chapters 8 on natural resources in particular. Several new case studies and a substantial rewrite

**11. How do you asses Rimisp contribution over all?**

RIMISP was a valuable partner. They provided a lot of input, as well as a unique perspective. Their entre into civil society was also very useful.

**12. In what areas do you feel Rimisp could enhance its work regarding future broad policy discussions?**

Rimisp could do more work on governance issues and more practical guidance on the roles of states, public private partnerships etc

## ***Annex 6. messages of the WDR2008 as influenced by Civil Society Workshop***

### **Overall message**

**“Agriculture can be a highly effective instrument to reduce world poverty.** Using this instrument to its potential is **urgent** as there is a **huge growth and welfare cost** to current under-investment in agriculture, mis-investment, policy neglect, and anti-agriculture and anti-rural poor policy biases. The emergence of a “new agriculture” and improved market, state, and civil society contexts provide **new opportunities** to use agriculture more effectively for development. However, agriculture will not reduce rural poverty alone: an inviting investment climate in the rural non-farm economy and opportunities for successful migration out of agriculture are also needed.”

### **Specific messages**

**1. Promote entrepreneurship in smallholder farming, and the conditions** -- capacities, opportunities, and feasibility -- **to make it successful**, particularly in agriculture-based countries where agricultural growth is the main potential engine of national growth and poverty reduction (Fm-led pathway).

**2. Secure diversified livelihoods and food security among subsistence smallholders**, with emphasis on marginalized groups, marginal areas, and households affected by shocks, particularly in agriculture-based countries (Fs-led pathway).

**3. Promote rural labor markets and the rural non-farm economy** to deliver good jobs and remunerative self-employment opportunities, in particular via territorial development. Invest massively in preparing populations for successful transitions out of agriculture in transforming economies (L- and M-led pathways).

**4. Put into place national, regional, and local consultative processes that can deliver and implement policies and investment programs favorable to agriculture.** These processes need to be based on the principles of decentralization, participation, and representation. The political economy of agricultural policy must be both supportive of agriculture in agriculture-based countries, and avoid the drift toward costly and inequitable subsidies in reducing income gaps in transforming and urbanizing economies.

**5. Enhance coordination and commitment of global actors to deliver more effectively on the global agenda**, including trade reforms, OECD farm policies, climate change, international public goods in science and technology, conservation and access to genetic resources, control of human and animal diseases, and rising energy prices.

### **Enhancing the capacity of rural entrepreneurs requires:**

- Access to **assets**: land, education/training, health.
- **Empowerment**: rural producer organizations for service, market power, and voice in public affairs.

**Enhancing opportunities for rural entrepreneurs requires improving the quality of the context where the assets are used**, in particular incentives (OECD and domestic farm policies), markets, public goods (infrastructure), institutional and technological innovations, the investment climate, and risk reduction instruments.

**Enhancing the political feasibility of policy recommendations in support of entrepreneurship requires:**

- **Politics:** Pro-agriculture coalitions (lobbies and influence) and state leadership (political support).
- **Governance:** Re-invent ministries of agriculture and complete decentralization for local accountability.